arXiv:1612.02405v1 [stat.ME] 7 Dec 2016

BIC strategies for model choice in a population approach

M. Delattre (1) and M.A. Poursat (2)

(1) AgroParisTech, UMR518 MIA-Paris, F-75231 Paris Cedex 05, France
INRA, UMR518 MIA-Paris, F-75231 Paris Cedex 05, France
(2) Laboratoire de Mathématiques d'Orsay, Univ. Paris-Sud, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, 91405 Orsay, France.

Abstract

We consider joint selection of fixed and random effects in general nonlinear mixed-effects models. We focus on BIC (Bayesian Information Criterion) strategies that are very popular among applied researchers. We derive an appropriate BIC's penalty to identify the effective random effects and their correlation structure. Then we provide an extension of the BIC introduced by Delattre *et al.* ([6]) to perform joint variable and random effects selection. We propose to use a stepwise algorithm to select the covariates of the model and the effective random effects simultaneously. A simulation study and a real pharmacology data analysis illustrate the good behaviour and the ease of use of the procedure.

Keywords: Bayesian Information Criterion, Nonlinear mixed effects models, Joint covariate and random effects selection, Stepwise procedure

1. Introduction

Mixed effects models are typically used in population studies where repeated measurements are observed from several subjects. They can be thought of hierarchically with one level for subjects and another level for correlated repeated measurements within subjects ([10]). To run a mixed model, the user must choose which regression variables affect the responses for all subjects. Then, the user must specify how model parameters vary among subjects. The inter-individual variability is modeled by introducing covariates and by adding random effects. If there are multiple random effects the correlation between these random effects may be specified. In almost all situations several models are considered and a selection must be used to choose among competing models. Two of the most widely applied selection criteria are the Akaike information criterion (AIC, [1]) and the Bayesian information criterion (BIC, [19]). When the true model is supposed to be finite dimensional, there is a consensus that BIC should be prefered on the grounds that it is consistent in selecting the true model ([14], [21]). In a previous paper ([6]), we derived a BIC expression that automatically adapts to the covariance structure of a mixed model. More precisely, we gave the appropriate BIC to perform covariate selection, i.e. to find the non-zero fixed-effects parameters, when the random effects structure of the model is known and fixed. In this paper, we extend this work to provide the correct BIC for joint selection of the fixed and random effect components of the model.

The selection of effective random effects is important, since changing the structure of one set of effects can lead to different choices of covariates for the other set of effects, or because redundant random effects may lead to a singular covariance matrix. Joint variable selection for fixed and random effects via penalty functions has been studied by many authors in recent years. For linear mixed models, Bondell et al. [2] and Fan and Li [7] proposed modifications of LASSO

procedures (Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator [20]) with L_1 penalties taken as a function of random effects. Within the framework of generalized linear mixed models, Pan and Huang ([15]), Chen et al. ([4]) and Schelldorfer et al. ([18]) proposed LASSO type algorithms. These methods heavily rely on the linear formalism of the models and are attractive in a high dimensional setting. The framework of our study is a general non-linear parametric class of mixed model where the number of relevant models is under control. We give the appropriate BIC value for choosing which random effects may be included in the model, and in case of multiple random effects, which of them are correlated. Then, following [6], we derive the BIC for joint selection of covariates and random effects, which is an hybrid BIC that penalizes the model parameters either by the logarithm of the number of subjects or by the logarithm of the total number of observations. The paper provides theoretical justification for these penalty terms.

Using BIC as a model selection tool suffers the drawback that the criterion needs to be evaluated for any candidate model, which can be laborious when the number of competing models is high. This is actually the case when one performs joint variable and random effects selection in mixed-effects models, even for moderate numbers of covariates and moderate numbers of potential random effects. To overcome this difficulty, we have adapted a stepwise selection method to our setting. The algorithm is designed for every practical situations where the size of the collection of competing models is large but finite. This was motivated by real clinical data, which displayed a dozen covariates and four random effects, and which was collected to characterize the pharmacokinetic variability between patients receiving an antibiotic called Amikacin.

The organization of the paper is outlined as follows. The general model formulation is given in section 2. In section 3, the BIC strategy for selecting the effective random effects is discussed. Then, a stepwise covariates and random effects selection procedure is described. The analysis of the real Amikacin data is provided in section 4. In section 5, a simulation study is carried out to assess the capacity of the proposed method to identify the random effects in the model. Technical details are gathered in the appendix.

2. Model and problem formulation

2.1. Nonlinear mixed effects models

Mixed-effects models are typically used for analyzing repeated data from several individuals simultaneously. In the present work, we adopt the hierarchical formalism of [10] or [16] which includes a very broad class of mixed-effects models, whether linear or nonlinear. Let N be the number of subjects and let $y_i = (y_{i1}, \ldots, y_{i,n_i})$ be the $n_i \times 1$ vector of observations for subject i, where $y_{ij},\ j = 1, \ldots, n_i$ denotes the jth measure observed under time condition t_{ij} and possible additional conditions u_i under which individual i is observed (such as drug dose in a pharmacological study for instance). We write $x_{ij} = (t_{ij}, u_i)$ the values of the so-called regression variables or design variables for subject i and we denote $x_i = (x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{i,n_i})$. Population studies try to explain the variability of the observed profiles (x_i, y_i), $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and to determine if some of the variation is purely random or if it is associated with known individual characteristics c_i (such as weight or age for instance). Assuming that the N subjects are mutually independent, a mixed effects model may be presented in two stages:

- *Stage 1 (individual-level model):* the same structural model is used for each individual series of observations

$$y_i|\psi_i \sim p(\cdot|\psi_i; x_i). \tag{2.1}$$

  For individual i, it depends on the set of regression variables x_i and a $d \times 1$ vector of individual parameters ψ_i. $p(\cdot|\psi_i; x_i)$ may be any discrete or continuous distribution providing a reliable description of the within-individual behavior. It can be either a linear, a

generalized linear or a nonlinear model. Many examples can be found in [10] or [16]. Note that even complex models like hidden Markov models can be used (see for example [5]).

- *Stage 2 (population model):* it characterizes how the individual parameters ψ_i vary from one subject to another with respect to some known characteristics (the covariates c_i) and some unknown (random) variation in the population:

$$\psi_i \sim p(\cdot|\theta; c_i). \tag{2.2}$$

The vector of parameters θ is called population parameter. In the present work, we will assume that the individual parameters ψ_i are Gaussian random variables such that:

$$\psi_i = C_i\beta + \eta_i, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\eta_i \underset{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$, $\Omega = (\omega_{kl})_{1\leq k,l\leq d}$ is a $d \times d$ covariance matrix, $C_i = C(c_i)$ is a matrix of covariates for individual i and β is a vector of fixed-effects. It is not a much restrictive framework since positive structural model parameters (if $p(\cdot|\psi_i; x_i)$ is a Poisson distribution for instance) can be easily modeled by means of the exponential of a Gaussian random variable ($\exp(\psi_i)$) and probabilities (if $p(\cdot|\psi_i; x_i)$ is a binomial distribution for instance) by means of the inverse logit of a Gaussian random variable ($\exp(\psi_i)/(1+\exp(\psi_i))$). Note however that the Gaussian assumption is crucial for deriving the appropriate BIC penalty from the Laplace approximation as detailed in the appendix section.

Remark: The ψ_is are not observed in practice, the y_{ij}s are the only available observations from the previous two-stage model.

2.2. Identification of the between-subjects variability sources

Several model selection problems arise in mixed effects models. One could either be interested in identifying the relevant model covariates or the relevant random effects structure of the model or most often in practice, jointly the two of them. Covariate selection using BIC in nonlinear mixed effects models when the random effects structure is fixed has been addressed in [6], but the identification of the relevant random effects with BIC has never been studied from a theoretical point of view.

Technically speaking, identifying effective random effects amounts to identifying the non null diagonal elements of Ω. Indeed, setting $\omega_{kk} = 0$ is equivalent to defining η_{ik} as a purely fixed zero-valued parameter. From the regularization methods published in the literature, we can see that one possible difficulty in deriving random effects selection criteria is the compliance with key constraints on the covariance matrix of the random effects (positive semidefiniteness in particular). An adequate parametrization of Ω is often required, and many authors have resorted to a Cholesky decomposition (see for example [2, 8, 15]). The key is then to decompose Ω as follows:

$$\Omega = \Lambda\Gamma\Gamma'\Lambda, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\Gamma = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)$ and Λ is a lower triangular matrix with 1s as its diagonal elements. With this formalism, identifying the non null components among $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)$ allows to retrieve the effective random effects of the model.

Our model selection problem is however more general than only finding the effective random effects. Our aim is to identify the most coherent random effects structure given the data. As a consequence, we are also interested in identifying the relevant correlations between individual random effects. Hence, model selection amounts to selecting the true non zero terms in the whole covariance matrix Ω instead of the non zero diagonal terms of Ω. Looking for effective

correlations between random effects can be relevant in practice, see [3] for a concrete example in pharmacology. The Cholesky decomposition of Ω given by equation (2.4) is however insufficient to tackle this more general issue. The correlations between effective random effects are consequently not investigated by the majority of the proposed random effects selection methods.

We will see that BIC strategies overcome these technical difficulties. They do not require any transformation of Ω and they are able to tackle every type of random effects structures, either diagonal or not. As in [6], we will use a degenerate model formulation induced by reordering the individual parameter the following way: $\psi_i = \left(\psi_{F,i}\,,\,\psi_{R,i}\right)'$, where $\psi_{F,i}$ and $\psi_{R,i}$ respectively stand for the non random and the random components of the individual parameter. If the $\psi_{F,i}$s are not empty, Ω is singular and can be written as $\Omega = \mathrm{diag}(0, \Omega_R)$, where Ω_R is the covariance matrix of the $\psi_{R,i}$s, thus invertible. This decomposition of the individual parameters induces a particular decomposition of the fixed effects and of the population parameters. Indeed, writting

$$\psi_i = \begin{pmatrix}\psi_{F,i}\\ \psi_{R,i}\end{pmatrix},\ C_i = \begin{pmatrix}C_{F,i} & 0\\ 0 & C_{R,i}\end{pmatrix},\ \eta_i = \begin{pmatrix}\eta_{F,i}\\ \eta_{R,i}\end{pmatrix},$$

we get

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix}\beta_F\\ \beta_R\end{pmatrix},\ \theta = \begin{pmatrix}\theta_F\\ \theta_R\end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\theta_R = (\beta_R, \mathrm{vec}(\Omega_R))$, $\theta_F = \beta_F$ and $\mathrm{vec}(\Omega_R)$ is the set of non zero elements of Ω_R. Characterizing the inter-individual variability sources amounts to jointly identifying the non null components in β_F, β_R and Ω.

3. BIC strategies for nonlinear mixed models

3.1. BIC for random effects selection

Let us recall the appropriate BIC expression for covariate selection in nonlinear mixed effects models (see [6]):

$$BIC_h = -2\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta}) + \dim(\beta_R)\log N + \dim(\beta_F)\log n_{\mathrm{tot}}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $n_{\mathrm{tot}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} n_i$ denotes the total number of observations, β_R and β_F are specified by equation (2.5), and $\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta})$ represents the log-likelihood of the observations evaluated at the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of the population parameter. We can provide a heuristic justification to the penalties associated to the different sets of parameters in (3.1) and (3.2). Let us recall that the individual parameters ψ_i are not observed in practice. This is typically why BIC theory is not straightforward in mixed models. But let us imagine that both the y_{ij}s and the ψ_is were observed. Then, the parameters β_R could be estimated by means of the N observations of the $\psi_{R,i}$s in a classical Gaussian model (see (2.3)), hence the $\log(N)$ penalty for these parameters. On the contrary, estimating parameters β_F would still require the n_{tot} observations y_{ij} and model (2.1), hence the $\log(n_{tot})$ penalty. Theoretically, the penalties $\log(N)$ and $\log(n_{tot})$ come from the convergence rates of the parameter maximum likelihood estimates when $(N, \min n_i) \to +\infty$. Some sketch of proof is provided in the appendix section.

(3.1) was derived in a specific (but unrealistic) setting where the random effects structure was fixed. Let us now adapt BIC for random effects structure selection and consider for that purpose that the covariate structure $C_i\beta$ is fixed and known. Then, the parameters of interest are the (non null) variance and covariance terms in Ω, which we denote by $\mathrm{vec}(\Omega)$. By using the same lines as in [6], we obtain the following result.

Proposition 1. *Assume that the data* $\mathbf{y}$ *are modeled by* (2.1), (2.2) *and* (2.3). *Under assumptions (A1) to (A5) formulated in the appendix section, the BIC procedure for selecting the random effects' structure consists in selecting the model that minimizes:*

$$BIC_V = -2\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta}) + |vec(\Omega)|\log(N), \tag{3.2}$$

where $|vec(\Omega)|$ *denotes the number of non zero elements of* Ω, *and* $\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta})$ *represents the log-likelihood of the observations evaluated at the maximum likelihood estimate* $\hat{\theta}$ *of the population parameter.*

3.2. BIC for joint variable and random effects selection

BIC_h and BIC_V are not satisfying model choice criteria since covariate and random effects structure selection are rarely tackled separately in practice. It is worth noting that BIC_h and BIC_V rely on similar assumptions and lines of proof. Hence, it is rather straightforward to show that coupling the penalties of BIC_h and BIC_V leads to an appropriate criterion for joint variable and random effects selection in nonlinear mixed effects models.

Proposition 2. *Assume that the data* $\mathbf{y}$ *are modeled by* (2.1), (2.2) *and* (2.3). *Under assumptions (A1) to (A6), the BIC procedure for jointly selecting variables and the random effects' structure consists in selecting the model that minimizes:*

$$BIC_{joint} = -2\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta}) + \dim(\theta_R)\log N + \dim(\theta_F)\log n_{\text{tot}},$$

where θ_R *and* θ_F *are given by* (2.5).

Remark: Computing $\hat{\theta}$ and $\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta})$ are also difficult problems in practice in many nonlinear mixed-effects models. Indeed, as the random effects η_i are not observed, the expression of $\ell(\mathbf{y};\theta)$ involves integrals over the distributions of the ψ_i that often don't have any closed form expression:

$$\ell(\mathbf{y};\theta) = \log\left[\prod_{i=1}^{N}\int p(\mathbf{y}_i|\psi_i)p(\psi_i;\theta)d\psi_i\right].$$

Nevertheless, many methods have been developed to estimate the model parameters and to compute approximations of $\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta})$. These are mostly implemented in the different software packages dealing with mixed models.

3.3. A stepwise algorithm

An exhaustive research of the most appropriate model for the ψ_i among all the possible random effects and covariate structures Ω and $C_i\beta$ is rarely possible in practice, even for moderate numbers of individual parameters d and covariates q. In such cases, one solution is to perform stepwise model selection. For joint random effects structure and covariate selection in nonlinear mixed effects models, we propose to transpose the usual stepwise selection methods as follows.

Step by step covariate and random effects selection

1. Start with no covariates in the model.
2. For all possible random effects structures, compute their BIC value. Choose the structure with the lowest BIC. Let's denote Ω_k the retained random effects structure and BIC_k the corresponding BIC value.
3. For Ω_k fixed and for each individual parameter, try to add one covariate in their definition. Choose the covariate model with the lowest BIC value less than BIC_k. Let's denote C_ℓ the retained covariate model and BIC_ℓ the corresponding BIC value.
4. For C_ℓ fixed and for all possible random effects structures, compute their BIC value. Choose the structure with the lowest BIC.
5. Continue until the random effects structure and the covariate model can not be changed.

Note that we could modify the previous method by starting with the full covariate model, or any other covariate model $C_i\beta$, and remove or add covariates one step after the other.

4. BIC in practice: the Amikacin data

We will now illustrate the use of the proposed criterion on a real data example.

4.1. About the data and their original analysis

We use the clinical pharmacology study published in [3]. In this study, 60 patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) received a 20 mg/kg single infusion dose of Amikacin. The Amikacin blood concentration was then measured at different times. Twelve covariates were also measured for each patient during the experiment, including the age, the sex, the total body weight, the PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio which characterizes respiratory distress syndrome, the 4-h creatinine clearance, ... One of the objectives of this work was to characterize the pharmacokinetic variability between patients suffering from VAP. The identification of coherent random effects and covariate structures was therefore a critical issue. In this study, the steps for model selection were quite empirical (as evidenced by the supplementary materials). Indeed, no clear procedure is actually available for nonlinear mixed effects models frameworks. We illustrate our BIC based methodology on this concrete example.

Several PK models can be used for describing the concentration C of Amikacin. Let's D denote the dose of drug, t_D the time at which the drug is administered and T_{inf} the infusion duration and ψ the PK parameters. In [3], the following models were tested:

1. *a one-compartment model*
   $C(D, t, t_D, T_{inf}, \psi) =$

$$\frac{D}{(T_{inf} \cdot k \cdot V)} \times (1 - e^{-k(t-t_D)}) \text{ if } t - t_D \leq T_{inf}$$

$$\frac{D}{(T_{inf} \cdot k \cdot V)} \times (1 - e^{-kT_{inf}}) \times e^{-k(t-t_D-T_{inf})} \text{ otherwise.} \tag{4.1}$$

Here $\psi = (k, V)$, k is the elimination rate constant and V is the volume of distribution.

2. *a two-compartments model*
$C(D, t, t_D, T_{inf}, \psi) =$

$$\frac{D}{T_{inf}}\left[\frac{A}{\alpha}(1-e^{-\alpha(t-t_D)})+\frac{B}{\beta}(1-e^{-\beta(t-t_D)})\right] \text{ if } t-t_D \leq T_{inf}$$

$$\frac{D}{T_{inf}}\left[\frac{A}{\alpha}(1-e^{-\alpha T_{inf}})e^{-\alpha(t-t_D-T_{inf})}+\frac{B}{\beta}(1-e^{-\beta T_{inf}})e^{-\beta(t-t_D-T_{inf})}\right]$$

otherwise (4.2)

where

$$A=\frac{1}{V_1}\frac{\alpha-Q/V_2}{\alpha-\beta}\ ;\ B=\frac{1}{V_1}\frac{\beta-Q/V_2}{\beta-\alpha}\ ;\ \alpha=\frac{QCl}{V_1V_2\beta}\ ;$$

$$\beta=\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{Q}{V_1}+\frac{Q}{V_2}+\frac{Cl}{V_1}-\sqrt{\left(\frac{Q}{V_1}+\frac{Q}{V_2}+\frac{Cl}{V_1}\right)^2-4\frac{Q}{V_2}\frac{Cl}{V_1}}\right].$$

Here $\psi=(Q, Cl, V_1, V_2)$, Cl is the Amikacin clearance, V_1 is the central volume of distribution, V_2 is the peripheral volume of distribution, and Q is the inter-compartmental clearance.

The observations (y_{ij}, $1 \leq j \leq n_i$) of individual i are then modeled as follows:

$$y_{ij} = C_{ij} + (a + b\, C_{ij})\, \epsilon_{ij}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $C_{ij} = C(D_i, t_{ij}, t_{D,i}, T_{inf,i}, \psi_i)$, $x_{ij} = (D_i, t_{ij}, t_{D,i}, T_{inf,i})$ are the regression variables, ψ_i are the PK (pharmacokinetic) individual parameters for patient i, and the residual errors ϵ_{ij} are iid centered Gaussian random variables with variance σ^2. Due to positivity constraints, ψ_i are log-normal random variables, *i.e.* $\log \psi_i$ is Gaussian, such that $\log \psi_i = C_i\beta + \eta_i$, where $\eta_i \underset{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$ and $C_i = C(c_i)$ is the matrix of covariates for individual i.

4.2. A small sensitivity analysis based on the Amikacin data

In the present paragraph, we try to get an idea of the robustness of our model selection methodology. For simplicity, we exclude the censored Amikacin data (corresponding to concentrations under the limit of detection) bringing us to $N = 53$ and $n_{tot} = 247$. In order to limit the maximal number of random effects, thus the number of possible random effects structures, we use the most simple PK model with only one compartment (4.1). We also restrict to only three covariates: 4-h creatinine clearance (ClCr), body weight (w) and PaO_2/FIO_2 (P/F). We implement our model selection methodology with the R software. We use the `saemix` package for the estimation of the parameters and the computation of the log-likelihoods.

We first detail in Table 2 the steps of the forward selection procedure presented above with BIC_{joint}. The procedure starts without any covariate and converges in a few steps (8 in total). The number of explored models is highly limited in comparison with an exhaustive research. In the selected model, the elimination rate constant k varies according to the patients' weight and their 4-h creatinine clearance, the volume V depends on 4-h creatinine clearance, and both parameters are random and correlated.

The estimation of the parameters and of the likelihood for nonlinear mixed effects models often require stochastic methods (see for example [5] and [9]) which induce some variability on

the computation of BIC. This technical variability can slightly modify the selected model. For example, we have run again the stepwise procedure with BIC_{joint} on the Amikacin data. We show two other runs in Tables 3 and 4. In both cases, the procedure converges more quickly (6 steps instead of 8), the selected models have the same random effects structure as above but the covariate structure is slightly changed. The BIC associated to the three final models are nevertheless consistent: 1746.144, 1746.273, and 1747.640. Note that the final model can also be different depending on the covariate model used for starting the procedure. Starting with no or few covariates (as for the forward procedure) would rather favor models with a complex random effects structure and a moderate number of covariates. On the contrary, starting with a high number of covariates (as for the backward procedure) would rather limit the random effects structure by eventually keeping a high number of covariates. Here, using a backward procedure leads to a very different model than the forward procedure, since the final model includes only one random effect on parameter k, but two covariates w and $ClCr$ on parameter k and the three covariates on parameter V (see Table 5). The BIC_{joint} of the retained model is 1747.918, thus very close to what was obtained by the forward procedure. The sensitivity of such step by step model selection methods is a relatively well-known phenomenon. To improve the model selection procedure, it is usually recommended to start the selection process several times and to compare the retained models in order to select the best one according to the criteria used within the selection process. However, we recommend to be careful with the starting points of the procedures. Starting with a too complex covariate model could compromise the proper conduct of the method. Indeed, the estimation methods for mixed effects models can encounter numerical difficulties especially with overly complex models. Likewise looking at all the possible random effects structure at each step of the step by step selection procedure could be prohibitive. If appropriate, one could first restrict the stepwise procedure to diagonal covariance structures, and then based on the selected model, try to add some correlations between random effects and investigate if it improves BIC or not.

At last, let's recall that the stepwise procedure for joint random effects and covariate selection in nonlinear mixed effects models described above could run with other criteria than BIC_{joint} such as:

$$\begin{aligned} AIC &= -2\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta}) + 2\dim(\theta), \\ BIC_N &= -2\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta}) + \dim(\theta)\log(N), \\ BIC_{n_{tot}} &= -2\ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta}) + \dim(\theta)\log(n_{tot}). \end{aligned}$$

We have tried the same process with BIC_N and BIC_{ntot} on the Amikacin data. For the sake of brevity, we have chosen not to show the detailed result in the paper. Even if the values of the criteria computed at each step are different, the intermediary selected models and the final result remain the same. This is however proper to these given dataset and example. In other situations, some differences could occur according to the penalization which is used. Nevertheless, we highly recommend the use of BIC_{joint} instead of other versions of BIC. Indeed, the penalty of BIC_{joint} has a theoretical justification for the joint random effects and covariate selection issue in nonlinear mixed effects models.

4.3. Results on the Amikacin data

Let us now analyze the Amikacin data in full with a two-compartments model (see equation (4.2)) as in [3]. In this model, ψ_i has four components. We try to characterize the inter-patients variability by choosing an appropriate random effects structure on ψ_i and by conveniently including some covariates in the definition of ψ_i. Twelve covariates were measured on each patient. We use a stepwise procedure based on BIC_{joint}. To avoid numerical difficulties due to model

complexity, we choose to start with the null covariate model. As the number of random effects structures for ψ_i is high, we choose to restrict the stepwise model research to diagonal covariance matrices and then try to add some correlations between the random effects of the retained model in a second step. As above, we exclude the censored Amikacin data. As a consequence, we don't exactly use the same data as [3]. We have $N = 53$ and $n_{tot} = 247$. In order to allow model comparison, Burdet's model is re-estimated based on this new dataset. The stepwise procedure leads to the model described in Table 1, left. It includes only three random effects, parameter Q is not random. Since adding correlations between the three random effects does not improve BIC_{joint}, it is our final model. Burdet's model is recalled on the rigth part of Table 1. There are many differences between our final model and the one retained in [3]. Our model includes more covariates and less random effects than Burdet's one, but the parameter values of both models are consistent. The selected covariates are all significant in both models. Generally speaking in a mixed-effects model, the random effects aim at describing the part of the inter-individual variability that cannot be explained by the observed covariates. Our final model is quite satisfactory in this sense. Indeed, the included covariates allow to limit the complexity of the random effects structure whereas in Burdet's model, the covariance matrix of the random effects is full. Moreover, our final model has a smaller BIC (whether BIC_{joint} or BIC_N) than Burdet's model.

4.4. Conclusion

The present application has provided very convincing results. We don't pretend that this methodology finds the best covariate model and the best random effects structure but it mainly has two advantages. First, it is to our knowledge the only methodology that applies to any mixed-effects model whether linear or nonlinear. Second, it is simple and easy to use even if the user should stay alert to the adjustment of the underlying algorithms that provide model estimation and likelihood implementation. A general `R` function relying on the `saemix` `R`-package outputs is available on request.

5. Simulation study

The objective of this section is to evaluate the performance of BIC_V for random effects selection in nonlinear mixed-effects models. The simulations are performed with the R software. The `mlxR` package is used for simulating the data, whereas the `saemix` package is used for model inference and computation of the log-likelihood.

We'll consider the following nonlinear mixed-effects model which is widely used in pharmacokinetics (PK):

$$y_{ij} = \frac{d_i k_{a,i}}{V_i(k_{a,i} - k_i)} \left[e^{-k_i t} - e^{-k_{a,i} t}\right] + \epsilon_{ij} \, , \, i = 1, \ldots, N \, , \, j = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{5.1}$$

where $\epsilon_{ij} \underset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. The individual PK parameters $k_{a,i}$, k_i, V_i are specified by:

$$\begin{aligned} \log k_{a,i} &= \beta_1 + \eta_{i,1}, \\ \log k_i &= \beta_2 + \eta_{i,2}, \\ \log V_i &= \beta_3 + \eta_{i,3}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where $\eta_i = (\eta_{i,1}, \eta_{i,2}, \eta_{i,3})' \underset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$. d_i is a regression variable for subject i which represents the drug dose he receives.

5.1. Uncorrelated random effects

We first consider uncorrelated random effects, *ie* a covariance matrix of the form

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{ka}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_k^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_V^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, the selection problem reduces to selecting the non zero elements of $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$. There are $2^3 = 8$ possible covariance models. We simulate data under only four of them:

$$\begin{aligned} M_0 &: \omega_{ka} = 0\,,\, \omega_k = 0\,,\, \omega_V = 0, \\ M_{1,V} &: \omega_{ka} = 0\,,\, \omega_k = 0\,,\, \omega_V \neq 0, \\ M_{2,V,k} &: \omega_{ka} = 0\,,\, \omega_k \neq 0\,,\, \omega_V \neq 0, \\ M_3 &: \omega_{ka} \neq 0\,,\, \omega_k \neq 0\,,\, \omega_V \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The aim is to recover the true number of random effects and the random individual parameters of the model. For each of the four previous models, we simulate 100 datasets with $N = 20$ subjects and $n = 9$ time points per subject (at $t = 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40$). For each simulated dataset, the value of BIC_V is computed for the 8 possible covariance models:

$$\begin{aligned} M_0 &: \omega_{ka} = 0\,,\, \omega_k = 0\,,\, \omega_V = 0, \\ M_{1,V} &: \omega_{ka} = 0\,,\, \omega_k = 0\,,\, \omega_V \neq 0, \\ M_{1,ka} &: \omega_{ka} \neq 0\,,\, \omega_k = 0\,,\, \omega_V = 0, \\ M_{1,k} &: \omega_{ka} = 0\,,\, \omega_k \neq 0\,,\, \omega_V = 0, \\ M_{2,ka,k} &: \omega_{ka} \neq 0\,,\, \omega_k \neq 0\,,\, \omega_V = 0, \\ M_{2,ka,V} &: \omega_{ka} \neq 0\,,\, \omega_k = 0\,,\, \omega_V \neq 0, \\ M_{2,V,k} &: \omega_{ka} = 0\,,\, \omega_k \neq 0\,,\, \omega_V \neq 0, \\ M_3 &: \omega_{ka} \neq 0\,,\, \omega_k \neq 0\,,\, \omega_V \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

When the individual parameters involve pure random effects, we choose the following values for their standard deviations: $\omega_{ka} = 0.2$, $\omega_k = 0.1$, $\omega_V = 0.3$. Parameter σ is set to 0.3. The results of this Monte-Carlo simulation study are displayed Figure 6.2. We can remark that the true covariance model is mostly selected by BIC_V, except when the true model includes three random effects. When the data are simulated under M_3, BIC_V selects the true covariance model half of the cases, and the model including two random effects, on parameters k_a and V, otherwise. The parameter (k) that BIC_V considers as a non random parameter in these cases is the parameter having the lowest variance. Additional simulations (see Figure 6.2) show that when the number of subjects or the value of ω_k are higher, BIC_V is then able to select the true model in a larger proportion of cases. These results corroborate that the performances of BIC_V in random effects selection depend on the sample size and on the levels of variability affecting the random effects of the model.

5.2. Correlated random effects

We now investigate the performances of BIC_V when some random effects of the model are correlated. The aim is now to recover the correlations between random effects when they

exist. For that purpose, we consider again the model defined by equations (5.1) and (5.2). We simulate 100 datasets with $N = 20$ subjects and $n = 9$ time points per subject (at $t = 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40$) under this model with the following covariance structure for the individual parameters: $\eta_i = (\eta_{i,1}, \eta_{i,2}, \eta_{i,3})' \underset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega)$ where

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{ka}^2 & 0 & \omega_{ka,V} \\ 0 & \omega_k^2 & 0 \\ \omega_{ka,V} & 0 & \omega_V^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We use the same values as above for the random effects' standard deviation and the residual standard deviation: $\omega_{ka} = 0.2$, $\omega_k = 0.1$, $\omega_V = 0.3$, $\sigma = 0.3$. We consider different values for the covariance between parameters V and ka: $\omega_{ka,V} = 0.3$, $\omega_{ka,V} = 0.5$ and $\omega_{ka,V} = 0.8$. For each simulated dataset, the value of BIC_V is computed for all random effects structure involving three random effects:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_0 &: \omega_{ka,k} = 0, \omega_{ka,V} = 0, \omega_{k,V} = 0; \\
\Omega_1 &: \omega_{ka,k} \neq 0, \omega_{ka,V} = 0, \omega_{k,V} = 0; \\
\Omega_2 &: \omega_{ka,k} = 0, \omega_{ka,V} \neq 0, \omega_{k,V} = 0; \\
\Omega_3 &: \omega_{ka,k} = 0, \omega_{ka,V} = 0, \omega_{k,V} \neq 0; \\
\Omega_4 &: \omega_{ka,k} \neq 0, \omega_{ka,V} \neq 0, \omega_{k,V} \neq 0;
\end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_{\ell,\ell'}$ denotes the covariance between parameters ℓ and ℓ'. Ω_2 corresponds to the random effects structure which was used for simulating the data. We are interested in the frequency at which each random effects structure is selected by BIC_V. The results are displayed Figure 6.2. The more $\omega_{ka,V}$ and N are high, the more frequently the true random effects structure is recovered by BIC_V. When BIC_V fails to choose the true random effects structure, it mainly chooses structure Ω_0 which corresponds to the absence of correlations between individual parameters. It is particularly the case when the correlation between parameters ka and V is low (0.3 or 0.5) thus difficult to detect. Such a result thus seems coherent since Ω_0 is a particular case of Ω_2 obtained by setting $\omega_{ka,V}$ to 0.

References

[1] Akaike, H., *A new look at the statistical model identification.* IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control AC-19: 716-723. 1974

[2] Bondell, H., Krishna, A., and Ghosh, S., *Joint variable selection for fixed and random effects in linear mixed-effects models.* Biometrics 66: 1069-1077. 2010

[3] Burdet, C. et al., *Population pharmacokinetics of single-dose amikacin in critically ill patients with suspected ventilator-associated pneumonia.* Eur. J. Clin. Pharmacol 71: 75-83. 2015.

[4] Chen, Y., Fei, Y. and Pan, J., *Statistical Inference in Generalized Linear Mixed Models by Joint Modelling Mean and Covariance of non-normal random effects.* Open Journal of Statistics 5: 568-584. 2015.

[5] Delattre, M. and Lavielle, M., *Maximum likelihood estimation in discrete mixed hidden Markov models using the SAEM algorithm.* Computational Statistics and Data Analysis 56(6): 2073-2085. 2012.

[6] Delattre, M. , Lavielle, M. and Poursat, M.-A., *A note on BIC in mixed effects models.* EJS 8: 456-475. 2014.

[7] Fan, J., and Li, R.Z., *Variable selection in linear mixed effects models.* The Annals of Statistics 40(4): 2043-2068. 2012.

[8] Ibrahim, J., Zhu, H., Garcia, R. and Guo, R., *Fixed and Random Effects Selection in Mixed Effects Models.* Biometrics 67: 495-503. 2011.

[9] Kuhn, E. and Lavielle, M., *Maximum likelihood estimation in nonlinear mixed effects models.* Computational Statistics and Data Analysis 49(4): 1020-1038. 2005.

[10] Lavielle, M., *Mixed effects models for the population approach. Models, Tasks, Methods and Tools.* Chapman and Hall/CRC. 2014.

[11] Lebarbier, E. and Mary-Huard, T., *Une introduction au critère BIC : fondements théoriques et interprétation.* Journal de la SFdS 147(1): 39-57. 2006.

[12] Nie, L., *Strong consistency of the maximum likelihood estimator in generalized linear and nonlinear mixed-effects models.* Metrika 63: 123-143. 2006.

[13] Nie, L., *Convergence rate of the MLE in generalized linear and nonlinear mixed-effects models: Theory and applications.* Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference 137: 1787-1804. 2007.

[14] Nishii, R., *Asymptotic properties of criteria for selection of variables in mutiple regression.* Annals of Statistics 12: 758-765. 1984

[15] Pan, J. and Huang, C., *Random effects selection in generalized linear mixed models via shrinkage penalty function.* Statistics and Computing 24: 725-738. 2014.

[16] Pinheiro, J. and Bates, D., *Mixed-Effects Models in S and S-PLUS.* 1st ed. 2nd printing Springer-Verlag New York Inc, 2009.

[17] Raftery, A., *Bayesian Model Selection in Social Research.* Sociological Methodology. 15: 111-163. 1995.

[18] Schelldorfer, J., Meier, L. and Bühlman, P., *GLMMLasso: An Algorithm for High-Dimensional Generalized Linear Mixed Models Using L_1-Penalization.* Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics. 23, 2 : 460-477. 2014

[19] Schwarz, G., *Estimating the dimension of a model.* Annals of Statistics. 6: 461-464. 1978.

[20] Tibshirani, R., *Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso.* Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B, 58,1 : 267-288. 1996.

[21] Yang, Y., *Can the strenghts of AIC and BIC be shared? A conflict between model identification and regression estimation.* Biometrika, 92, 4: 937-950. 2005

6. Appendix: methodological support

6.1. Generalities on Bayesian Information Criterion in the specific context of mixed-effects models

The Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) evaluates the plausibility of competing statistical models given some sampled observations. More precisely, BIC provides an approximation of the a posteriori probability of each model of the collection given the data: $p(m|\mathbf{y})$. For a given model m with parameter θ_m, it is expressed as the sum of the log-likelihood $\ell(\mathbf{y};\theta_m)$ of the observations and a penalty term $\rho(\mathbf{y},\theta_m)$ which often depends on both the model dimension and the sample size ([11, 17, 19]). To alleviate the notations, we'll omit index m in the following.

The form of $\rho(\mathbf{y},\theta)$ is theoretically derived by evaluating the orders of the components of the Hessian matrix $H_{\hat{\theta}} = -\frac{\partial^2 \ell(\mathbf{y};\theta)}{\partial\theta\partial\theta'}_{|\theta=\hat{\theta}}$, where $\hat{\theta}$ is the maximum likelihood estimate of θ, when the sample size tends to infinity (see articles [11, 17] or [6] for more details about the theoretical fundations of BIC). $H_{\hat{\theta}}$ indeed appears in the Laplace approximation of $p(m|\mathbf{y})$ and determines its asymptotic behaviour:

$$\log p(m|\mathbf{y}) \approx \ell(\mathbf{y};\hat{\theta}) - \frac{1}{2}\log\det(H_{\hat{\theta}}). \tag{6.1}$$

In a mixed-effects model framework, such evaluation is particularly difficult. There are basically two reasons for that: *i)* the model parameter estimates sometimes have different rates of convergence when the sample size tends to infinity (see [12] and [13] for instance) and *ii)* the often complex expression of the model likelihood. The main challenge arises from the form of the likelihood. Indeed, the marginal likelihood $L(\mathbf{y}|\theta)$ is expressed as:

$$L(\mathbf{y};\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \int p(\mathbf{y}_i|\psi_i)p(\psi_i;\theta)d\psi_i.$$

The integrals above may have a closed form if the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{y}_i$ given ψ_i is Gaussian, but in general, $L(\mathbf{y}|\theta)$ is not explicit due to the complex form of $p(\mathbf{y}_i|\psi_i)$. To evaluate the orders of the second derivatives of the log-likelihood, the key is to use the Laplace approximation of the individual contributions to the likelihood $p(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta)$ (see [6]), where

$$p(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta) = \int p(\mathbf{y}_i|\psi_i)p(\psi_i;\theta)d\psi_i.$$

Using the following notations, $\ell(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta) = \log p(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta)$, $\ell(\mathbf{y}_i,\psi_i;\theta) = \log p(\mathbf{y}_i,\psi_i;\theta)$ and $\ell(\mathbf{y}_i|\psi_i) = \log p(\mathbf{y}_i|\psi_i)$, the Laplace method leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\partial^2\ell(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta)}{\partial\theta\partial\theta'} = \Bigg\{ & -\frac{\partial^2\ell(\mathbf{y}_i,\psi_i;\theta)}{\partial\theta\partial\theta'} \\ & + \frac{\partial^2\ell(\mathbf{y}_i,\psi_i;\theta)}{\partial\theta\partial\psi_i'}\left(\frac{\partial^2\ell(\mathbf{y}_i,\psi_i;\theta)}{\partial\psi_i\partial\psi_i'}\right)^{-1}\frac{\partial^2\ell(\mathbf{y}_i,\psi_i;\theta)}{\partial\theta'\partial\psi_i}\Bigg\}_{\psi_i=\widehat{\psi}_i} + \mathcal{O}(n_i^{-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where $\hat{\psi}_i = \underset{\psi_i}{\text{argmax}}\ \ell(\mathbf{y}_i,\psi_i;\theta)$. The BIC penalty is then inferred from an appropriate evaluation of the main term in (6.2) in a double asymptotic framework where $N, \min_i n_i \to \infty$ and $N/(\min_i n_i) \to \infty$. Such asymptotic is natural in a mixed effects model framework where the sample size depends on both the number of subjects and the number of observations per subject. The evaluation of (6.2) requires suitable assumptions and depends on the model selection task.

6.2. Assumptions

For ease of notation, but without loss of generality, we consider here that the number of observations n_i is the same for each subject $n_i = n$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. The theoretical study of BIC in a general nonlinear mixed-effects model requires to introduce the following assumptions, which are derived from [12, 13] and [6]. Let ϑ denote an open subset of the parameter space Θ and let $\theta^\star$ denote the true population parameter value. We assume that for any given n:

(A1) For all $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and for all $\theta \in \vartheta$, $p(\mathbf{y}_i; \theta)$ admits all first, second and third derivatives with respect to θ for almost all $\mathbf{y}_i$.

(A2) (i) There exists $M > 0$ such that for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$, for all $\theta \in \vartheta$ and all $k, l = 1, \ldots, q$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_i|\theta^\star}\left[\frac{\partial \ell(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta)}{\partial \theta_k}|_{\theta=\theta^\star}\right]^2 < M \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_i\theta^\star}\left[\frac{\partial^2 \ell(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta)}{\partial \theta_k \partial \theta_l}|_{\theta=\theta^\star}\right]^2 < M.$$

(ii) Moreover, there exists a sequence of functions $\{G_1(\mathbf{y}_1), \ldots, G_N(\mathbf{y}_N)\}$ such that for all $\theta \in \vartheta$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and for all $k, l, h = 1, \ldots, q$,

$$\left|\frac{\partial^3 \ell(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta)}{\partial \theta_k \partial \theta_l \partial \theta_h}\right| \leq G_i(\mathbf{y}_i) \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{y_i|\theta^\star}\left[G_i^2(\mathbf{y}_i)\right] \leq M.$$

(A3) Let $V_\theta = (H_{\theta^\star}^{-\frac{1}{2}}) H_\theta (H_{\theta^\star}^{-\frac{1}{2}})'$ for all $\theta \in \vartheta$, where H_θ denotes the negative Hessian matrix $-\dfrac{\partial^2 \ell(\mathbf{y}_i;\theta)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta'}$ computed at parameter value θ. Matrix $H_{\theta^\star}$ is positive definite and invertible, and

$$\max_{\theta \in \vartheta} ||V_\theta - I_q|| \underset{N \to +\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0,$$

where I_q stands for the $q \times q$ identity matrix.

(A4) $\liminf_{N \to +\infty} \lambda_N = \lambda > 0$ where λ_N is the smallest eigenvalue of matrix $\mathbb{E}(\frac{1}{N} H_{\theta^\star})$.

(A5) $$\frac{n}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_{y_i|\theta^\star} \left\{ \left[{\psi_{R,i}}' \left(-\frac{\partial^2 \ell(y_i|\psi_{R,i}, \theta_F)}{\partial \psi_{R,i} \partial {\psi_{R,i}}'} + \Omega_R^{-1} \right)^{-1} \psi_{R,i} \right]_{|\psi_i = \hat{\psi}_i} \right\} = o(1)$$

(A6) $$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_i|\theta^\star} \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\mathbf{y}_i|\psi_{R,i}, \theta_F)}{\partial \theta_F \partial {\psi_{R,i}}'} \left(-\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\mathbf{y}_i|\psi_{R,i}, \theta_F)}{\partial \psi_{R,i} \partial {\psi_{R,i}}'} + \frac{1}{n} \Omega_R^{-1} \right)^{-1} \psi_{R,i} \right]_{|\psi_i = \hat{\psi}_i} \right\} = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Assumptions (A1) to (A4) are standard regularity assumptions. Conditions (A5) and (A6) are crucial for evaluating $\log\det(H_{\hat{\theta}})$ (equation (6.1)) and deriving the appropriate BIC penalty. (A5) is particularly important in a random effects selection framework, whereas (A6) is only useful for covariate selection. Both assumptions ensure that the signal is sufficiently high with respect to the noise (in some sense to precise) to detect effective effects in the model.



Figure 1: Frequency of selection of the different random effects models under the different simulated scenarios (M_0, $M_{1,V}$, $M_{2,V,k}$, M_3).



Figure 2: Frequency of selection of the different random effects structures under M_3 with different values of N and ω_k.



Figure 3: Frequency of selection of the different random effects structures under M_3 with different values of N and $\omega_{ka,V}$. Ω_2 corresponds to the random effects structure used for the simulation of the data.

Parameter	Final Model			Burdet's Model		
	Estimate	RSE (%)	p-value	Estimate	RSE (%)	p-value
$CL(L/h)$	5.67	27.15		2.25	9.15	
$-\beta_{ClCr}$	4.85 $\times 10^{-3}$	15.54	6.2×10^{-11}	6 $\times 10^{-3}$	11.98	0
$-\beta_{age}$	-0.01	28.12	1.9 $\times 10^{-4}$	-	-	
$V_1(L)$	5.05	22.47		4.67	21.33	
$-\beta_{weight}$	0.01	21.05	1 $\times 10^{-6}$	0.01	20.92	8.7×10^{-7}
$-\beta_{P/F}$	2 $\times 10^{-3}$	32.63	1.1 $\times 10^{-3}$	2 $\times 10^{-3}$	25.67	4.9 $\times 10^{-5}$
$Q(L/h)$	6.77	12.37		12.23	6.77	
$-\beta_{sexe}$	0.55	24.04	1.6 $\times 10^{-5}$	-	-	
$V_2(L)$	14.62	12.72		21.28	6.46	
$-\beta_{ClCr}$	4 $\times 10^{-3}$	27.82	1.6 $\times 10^{-5}$	-	-	
ω_Q	-	-		0.05	78.9	
ω_{CL}	0.13	21		0.15	20.5	
ω_{V_1}	0.07	24		0.06	28.5	
ω_{V_2}	0.16	32		0.12	36.9	
$\rho(Cl, V_1)$	-	-		-0.11	$\star\star$	
$\rho(Cl, Q)$	-	-		-0.15	$\star\star$	
$\rho(V_1, Q)$	-	-		0.64	$\star\star$	
$\rho(Cl, V_2)$	-	-		0.42	$\star\star$	
$\rho(V_1, V_2)$	-	-		0.59	$\star\star$	
$\rho(Q, V_2)$	-	-		-0.15	$\star\star$	
a	0.28	31.36		0.37	27.29	
b	0.10	0.21		0.10	0.24	
BIC_{joint}		1492.624			1643.676	
BIC_N		1486.468			1649.833	

Table 1: Analysis of the Amikacin data. Estimation of the population parameters for the final model given by the stepwise joint selection procedure and for the final model of [3]. The horizontal line − indicates parameters that are not included in the model. $\star\star$ means that the RSE of the estimated correlations between random effects are not provided by the saemix R-package.

Steps	Random effects structure	Covariate model	BIC_{joint}
1	Ω_1	$C_1 = \{k(\varnothing), V(\varnothing)\}$ fixed	1824.410
	Ω_2		1914.514
	Ω_3		1787.605
	Ω_4		1791.097
2	Ω_3 fixed	$C_{2,1} = \{k(w), V(\varnothing)\}$	1791.403
		$C_{2,2} = \{k(ClCr), V(\varnothing)\}$	1765.485
		$C_{2,3} = \{k(P/F), V(\varnothing)\}$	1791.547
		$C_{2,4} = \{k(\varnothing), V(w)\}$	1774.442
		$C_{2,5} = \{k(\varnothing), V(ClCr)\}$	1776.608
		$C_{2,6} = \{k(\varnothing), V(P/F)\}$	1788.473
3	Ω_1	$C_{2,2} = \{k(ClCr), V(\varnothing)\}$	1785.979
	Ω_2	fixed	1812.734
	Ω_3		1765.485
	Ω_4		1755.799
4	Ω_4 fixed	$C_{4,1} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(\varnothing)\}$	1760.707
		$C_{4,2} = \{k(ClCr, P/F), V(\varnothing)\}$	1758.722
		$C_{4,3} = \{k(ClCr), V(w)\}$	1748.592
		$C_{4,4} = \{k(ClCr), V(ClCr)\}$	1748.738
		$C_{4,5} = \{k(ClCr), V(P/F)\}$	1759.138
5	Ω_1	$C_{4,3} = \{k(ClCr), V(w)\}$	1754.837
	Ω_2	fixed	1811.246
	Ω_3		1752.529
	Ω_4		1748.592
6	Ω_4 fixed	$C_{6,1} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(w)\}$	1746.144
		$C_{6,2} = \{k(ClCr, P/F), V(w)\}$	1752.895
		$C_{6,3} = \{k(ClCr), V(w, ClCr)\}$	1765.003
		$C_{6,4} = \{k(ClCr), V(w, P/F)\}$	1781.645
7	Ω_1	$C_{6,1} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(w)\}$	1751.483
	Ω_2	fixed	1798.835
	Ω_3		1747.57
	Ω_4		1746.144
8	Ω_4 fixed	$C_{8,1} = \{k(ClCr, w, P/F), V(w)\}$	1748.077
		$C_{8,2} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(w, P/F)\}$	1765.194
		$C_{8,3} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(w, ClCr)\}$	1755.559

Table 2: Forward procedure with BIC_{joint} on the Amikacin data. The intermediary selected models are brought out in grey. Here 8 steps are necessary before convergence of the process. At step 8, none of the considered models do improve the value of BIC_{joint}. The final model is thus the best model identified at step 7, that is the model with covariate structure $C_{6,1}$ and covariance structure Ω_4.

Steps	Random effects structure	Covariate model	BIC_{joint}
1	Ω_1	$C_1 = \{k(\varnothing), V(\varnothing)\}$ fixed	1824.789
	Ω_2		1914.403
	Ω_3		1790.906
	Ω_4		1793.083
2	Ω_3 fixed	$C_{2,1} = \{k(w), V(\varnothing)\}$	1791.707
		$C_{2,2} = \{k(ClCr), V(\varnothing)\}$	1763.976
		$C_{2,3} = \{k(P/F), V(\varnothing)\}$	1791.846
		$C_{2,4} = \{k(\varnothing), V(w)\}$	1773.790
		$C_{2,5} = \{k(\varnothing), V(ClCr)\}$	1776.455
		$C_{2,6} = \{k(\varnothing), V(P/F)\}$	1788.711
3	Ω_1	$C_{2,2} = \{k(ClCr), V(\varnothing)\}$	1786.608
	Ω_2	fixed	1812.650
	Ω_3		1763.976
	Ω_4		1754.854
4	Ω_4 fixed	$C_{4,1} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(\varnothing)\}$	1758.825
		$C_{4,2} = \{k(ClCr, P/F), V(\varnothing)\}$	1758.398
		$C_{4,3} = \{k(ClCr), V(w)\}$	1746.273
		$C_{4,4} = \{k(ClCr), V(ClCr)\}$	1747.876
		$C_{4,5} = \{k(ClCr), V(P/F)\}$	1757.682
5	Ω_1	$C_{4,3} = \{k(ClCr), V(w)\}$	1754.861
	Ω_2	fixed	1809.816
	Ω_3		1751.167
	Ω_4		1746.273
6	Ω_4 fixed	$C_{6,1} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(w)\}$	1747.819
		$C_{6,2} = \{k(ClCr, P/F), V(w)\}$	1767.327
		$C_{6,3} = \{k(ClCr), V(w, ClCr)\}$	1750.937
		$C_{6,4} = \{k(ClCr), V(w, P/F)\}$	1759.571

Table 3: Second run of the forward procedure with BIC_{joint} on the Amikacin data. The intermediary selected models are brought out in grey. Here 6 steps are necessary before convergence of the process. At step 6, none of the considered models do improve the value of BIC_{joint}. The final model is thus the best model identified at step 5, that is the model with covariate structure $C_{4,3}$ and covariance structure Ω_4.

Steps	Random effects structure	Covariate model	BIC_{joint}
1	Ω_1	$C_1 = \{k(\varnothing), V(\varnothing)\}$ fixed	1824.641
	Ω_2		1914.543
	Ω_3		1790.691
	Ω_4		1792.824
2	Ω_3 fixed	$C_{2,1} = \{k(w), V(\varnothing)\}$	1791.437
		$C_{2,2} = \{k(ClCr), V(\varnothing)\}$	1763.191
		$C_{2,3} = \{k(P/F), V(\varnothing)\}$	1791.484
		$C_{2,4} = \{k(\varnothing), V(w)\}$	1778.009
		$C_{2,5} = \{k(\varnothing), V(ClCr)\}$	1776.256
		$C_{2,6} = \{k(\varnothing), V(P/F)\}$	1788.387
3	Ω_1	$C_{2,2} = \{k(ClCr), V(\varnothing)\}$	1786.124
	Ω_2	fixed	1812.731
	Ω_3		1763.191
	Ω_4		1754.362
4	Ω_4 fixed	$C_{4,1} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(\varnothing)\}$	1758.278
		$C_{4,2} = \{k(ClCr, P/F), V(\varnothing)\}$	1757.785
		$C_{4,3} = \{k(ClCr), V(w)\}$	1748.334
		$C_{4,4} = \{k(ClCr), V(ClCr)\}$	1747.640
		$C_{4,5} = \{k(ClCr), V(P/F)\}$	1756.525
5	Ω_1	$C_{4,4} = \{k(ClCr), V(ClCr)\}$	1767.243
	Ω_2	fixed	1812.618
	Ω_3		1755.676
	Ω_4		1747.640
6	Ω_4 fixed	$C_{6,1} = \{k(ClCr, w), V(ClCr)\}$	1751.577
		$C_{6,2} = \{k(ClCr, P/F), V(ClCr)\}$	1751.602
		$C_{6,3} = \{k(ClCr), V(w, ClCr)\}$	1752.327
		$C_{6,4} = \{k(ClCr), V(ClCr, P/F)\}$	1750.317

Table 4: Third run of the forward procedure with BIC_{joint} on the Amikacin data. The intermediary selected models are brought out in grey. Here 6 steps are necessary before convergence of the process. At step 6, none of the considered models do improve the value of BIC_{joint}. The final model is thus the best model identified at step 5, that is the model with covariate structure $C_{4,4}$ and covariance structure Ω_4.

Steps	Random effects structure	Covariate model	BIC_{joint}
1	Ω_1	$C_1 = \{k(ClCr, w, P/F),\ V(ClCr, w, P/F)\}$	1749.007
	Ω_2	fixed	1803.182
	Ω_3		1750.788
	Ω_4		1759.7
2	Ω_1 fixed	$C_{2,1} = \{k(ClCr, P/F), V(w, ClCr, P/F)\}$	1751.95
		$C_{2,2} = \{k(w, P/F), V(w, ClCr, P/F)\}$	1776.89
		$C_{2,3} = \{k(w, ClCr), V(w, ClCr, P/F)\}$	1747.918
		$C_{2,4} = \{k(w, ClCr, P/F), V(ClCr, P/F)\}$	1780.971
		$C_{2,5} = \{k(w, ClCr, P/F), V(w, P/F)\}$	1753.323
		$C_{2,6} = \{k(w, ClCr, P/F), V(w, ClCr)\}$	1753.293
3	Ω_1	$C_{2,3} = \{k(w, ClCr), V(w, ClCr, P/F)\}$	1747.918
	Ω_2	fixed	1809.482
	Ω_3		1751.259
	Ω_4		1765.65
4	Ω_4 fixed	$C_{4,1} = \{k(ClCr), V(w, ClCr, P/F)\}$	1749.567
		$C_{4,2} = \{k(w), V(w, ClCr, P/F)\}$	1773.098
		$C_{4,3} = \{k(w, ClCr), V(ClCr, P/F)\}$	1779.332
		$C_{4,4} = \{k(w, ClCr), V(w, P/F)\}$	1754.555
		$C_{4,5} = \{k(w, ClCr), V(w, ClCr)\}$	1750.13

Table 5: Backward procedure with BIC_{joint} on the Amikacin data. The intermediary selected models are brought out in grey. Here 4 steps are necessary before convergence of the process. At step 4, none of the considered models do improve the value of BIC_{joint}.